



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

On the other hand, none of the better or the best MSS of Pliny give Quintus, and Jerome especially states in his Chronicle that the poet's name was Gaius, writing it out in full, whilst Apuleius Apolog. 10 writes C. Catullus.

It is noted with pleasure that Ellis has changed the spelling from Virgil to Vergil throughout this edition, in deference, he tells us, "to the arguments of the Roman jurist Castalio, *De Vergili nominis scribendi recta ratione*, Romae 1594.

Prof. Ellis's volume is by no means a reprint of that of 1876. There are comparatively few omissions from his former work, while the pages of the new edition are teeming with rich illustrative passages in both Greek and Latin, which no one but a deeply-read and profound scholar like Mr. Ellis could supply; this is especially the case with the quotations in Greek, from which his wide reading has enabled him to make such valuable selections. Again, in the Latin references he has wisely aimed to quote from "the predecessors or contemporaries, rather than from the followers of Catullus"; not only are these passages more pertinent than many of those in the first edition, but their number is so much increased that they occupy a by no means small proportion of the increase of 116 pages in this over the first edition.

Of the Clarendon Press work, as usual, there is nothing to be said except in commendation.

Amongst all these words of praise it is disagreeable to have to find fault, and grave fault too, with the index, which falls far short of any reasonable standard. It was always a drawback to the first edition that it was not indexed, and we hailed with delight the announcement that this want had been supplied in the present volume, but our disappointment was all the more keen when we found how insufficient it was. It purports to be an "Index of persons and things referred to in the Commentary," and we started to make a list of some of the more notable omissions, taken at random, such as Erycina, Aeneas, Ariadne, Prometheus, Helicon, Pessinus, Cybele, etc., but soon found that this meant the compiling of a new index, in comparison to which the present one would be but a small fraction, and abandoned the attempt.

It is not too often that the world is presented with the exhaustive and learned work of so ripe a scholar as Mr. Ellis, and every student of Catullus owes him a meed of thanks second only in gratitude to that due to the poet himself.

WILLIAM H. KLAPP.

The Latin Heptateuch, critically reviewed by JOHN E. B. MAYOR, M.A. Cambridge, University Press, 1889.

This interesting translation of the first seven books of the Old Testament into hexameter verse is, up to the present time, inaccessible in any one work, having undergone a strange history in its fragmentary publication. The first 165 verses of Genesis were published by Wm. Morel in 1560, and have been often reprinted in editions of Tertullian and Cyprian. In 1733 Martène added 1276 verses more from a MS of the ninth century, which completed the book of Genesis with the exception of chapter IX and a part of chapter X. In 1852 Cardinal Pitra published in the *Spicilegium Solesmense* the missing fragment of Genesis, the books of Exodus, Deuteronomy and Joshua, and parts of Leviticus and Numbers. Before his death, which occurred Feb. 9, 1889, he added

supplements to Leviticus and Numbers, and printed the book of Judges as far as to c. XVIII (Analecta sacra et classica Sp. Sol. parata, Paris and Rome, 1888). We have in all 5375 hexameter verses and 175 hendecasyllabics in lyrical passages. They are to be brought together in a critical edition by R. Peiper in the Vienna Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. The work of Mayor is preliminary to this promised edition, and is based upon the manuscript C, of the tenth century, belonging to Trinity College, Cambridge. Pitra had already transcribed this and collated two Laon MSS (A, B) for his edition of 1852, and he did not then publish the whole material because he hoped, without success, to find a new manuscript. C shows much divergence from Pitra's text, and its readings are generally, though not always, better. It is strange that so little has been known in Germany of anything but the version of Genesis, and that even Hartel and L. Müller in treating of the poem critically were not aware of Pitra's important publication. The burning question has hitherto been in regard to the authorship of this version. The manuscripts and catalogues have assigned it to various Christian authors, Tertullian, Cyprian, Alcimus Avitus, Juvencus, etc. The theory of Juvencus's authorship has been stoutly maintained by Pitra, even as late as 1888, as well as by Bähr, Schrödl, Daniel, Bernhardt and Gams. Metrical and stylistic considerations have led most critics to reject this claim, which is disposed of by Mayor, who shows that the passage E 526 ff. was originally addressed to Theodosius by Claudian in a poem of the year 396. It may seem gratuitous to give further grounds against J.'s authorship, but the theory of his connection with the poem has died so hard that it is perhaps justifiable to mention some other considerations:

a. The author of the Heptateuch has a predilection, amounting almost to a passion, for beginning a verse with the convenient dactyl *Illicet*, of which there are about 40 instances scattered throughout the poem: Juvencus has *none* in 3210 verses. b. Juvencus is very fond of long honorific titles of the Deity (see Marold's index). While the author of the Hept. uses *Tonans* = *Deus* with some frequency (G 65, 141, 168, etc.), there is a noticeable lack of the feature mentioned. The following expressions equivalent to *Deus* are not found in Juvencus: *Rex*, E 1162, 1191; *Potens*, G 205; *Maximus*, G 102. c. With the exception of a simile or two (I 687-689) or a "fine" description of nature, Juvencus takes no liberties with the text of Scripture, but compare:

Sethum (*read* Semum) Chamumque Jafetumque
In numerum solitos mollitum tundere ferrum

(G 226, 7) and G 179, E 443, 468, and the treatment of Exod. IV 24, Exod. X. d. Juvencus omits lists of proper names (Mat. I; X 2-4), but in the Hept. a laborious effort is made to bring them in, with results like

qui nomine vero
Dicuntur Ariac Hadachar Godullagomurus, G 426, 7.

and after a hard struggle with the Gergasenes and Ammonites (E 1143 seq.) the author makes the naïve confession:

Sed neque quam multae species nec nomina quae sunt
Lex numeris astricta potest depromere fando.

Other such lists are given in Gen. V, X, XI, Jo. 375, etc. *e.* In E 729 and throughout the book of Joshua Hept. has *Jēsus* as a dissyllable, while everywhere in Juvenecus the word is a trisyllable: *Īesus*.

Ebert (Allg. Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters im Abendlande², Leip. 1889, 114 ff.), in treating of the authorship of the Hept., is inclined to ascribe the first 600 verses of Genesis to Juvenecus, while in the remainder he sees the work of another author. The latter half of Genesis, he says, is much inferior to the first, especially as it becomes greatly abbreviated in its treatment, and at last is the crudest sort of versification. This theory of more than one hand in the authorship (which Mayor does not notice) cannot be accepted for a moment. The characteristic peculiarities of Genesis are maintained throughout. Even the condensation of the latter part is not so significant as might appear. The first 632 lines of the version of Genesis are concerned with the first 18 chapters of the Bible, which include 458 (prose) verses of Bible-text; or, in the first 632 lines the average is: .72 Bible-verses to the hexameter line. The last 863 lines (32 chapters) include 1075 verses of Bible-text, or 1.24 Bible-verses to the hexameter line. Yet in Gen. X (which falls before the 400th line) 32 verses are treated in 18 lines, or 1.77 Bible-verses to the hex. line, while the version of Joshua covers 658 verses in 585 lines, making the average of 1.12 Bible-verses to the hex. line.

It is due to Peiper that the authorship of the poem has been finally assigned, upon good manuscript authority, to Cyprian, and this not the African church-father, but in all probability the Bishop of Toulon in the middle of the sixth century. In company with Firminus and Viventius he wrote (or furnished the material for) the life of Caesarius of Arles, which is found in Migne's Patrol. Lat. LXVII 1000 ff. That in this life there can be found no resemblances to the style of the Hept. need not disparage the theory, for though in c. 39 *vae mihi misero Cypriano!* might point to him as the actual writer of the memoir, the succeeding *inter quos etiam sanctus Cyprianus Telonensis magnus et clarus enituit*, certainly shows that he could not have composed it all. Perhaps the disclaimer of all rhetorical art in the *præfatio* is also significant. At any rate, all the indications point to a Cyprian of Gaul, who flourished about this time, as the author of the whole version of the Heptateuch. The form of Mayor's work is discursive in the extreme, and with its dedications, quotations, biographies, "sponsors" and reminiscences is spread out to make a volume of 339 pages, without much regard to scientific method in arrangement. It is to be regretted that there is not a better description of the MSS, especially C. Mayor brings to his work extraordinary qualifications: a severe Latin scholar, with that thorough training in metrics possessed by English versifiers, he has also a mastery of the Fathers and especially of the Christian Latin poets, and makes brilliant use of this material on every page. The style is Mayor's own, and is too characteristic to be capable of description. His copious side-remarks are never dull, and are jubilant, censorious or laudatory according to circumstances. There is a rather amusing and self-conscious patronage of Pitra, whose valuable work is certainly inferior to Arevalo's in critical acumen, and not deserving the over-praise which it receives. The long preface (pp. vii-lxvi) gives a history of editions and previous criticism, nothing having escaped the notice of the author. There is also a very valuable summary of the metrical and linguistic

facts which this monument brings to light. The term "initial *a*" on p. xlix is ambiguous, and should be "*a* in the first syllable"; compare the examples given on the next page, and E 598 *hæres*, E 775 *hæreant*. To the list on p. l should be added: L 16 *mōerente*, E 307 *mōerore*, 456 *h̄ysopi*. To the list of words which are shortened in the first syllable should be added Jo. 516 *libamina* (but cf. *libare*, four lines later). The body of the book is given to critical emendations, some of which are very luminous, and in accordance with which the facts marshal themselves in line like drilled troops. E. g. E 82 *lictorum*, 196 *se Rex* for *senex*, 1323 *Auses*, etc. "Bentley's slashing hook," for which the author sighs, has certainly descended into his hands, and he purges unsparingly against the testimony of all the MSS. Mayor corrects everything (even the epigrams of his deceased master Kennedy), and we doubt whether Cyprian would recognize his own poem in many verses. He lays the blame upon scribes in regard to liberties which are consistently repeated throughout the poem—so *fiunt*, G 6, 282, 429, E 450, 774, etc. Why should we attribute to the scribe the frequently recurring *vādentem*, etc., which all the MSS attest? So with *dāturus* G 224, 878. I cannot think it necessary to change *præter*, which occurs in G 1036, E 694, Jo. 12, Ju. 402. Granted that such liberties offend all of one's metrical sensibilities, is it not abundantly shown elsewhere that, in matters of prosody, our Cyprian is *capable de tout*? Why might not *cūpitam* stand at the head of E 114, in the light of the numerous examples on p. li? So Mayor does away with the ἀπαξ λεγ. *clarigenus* E 1187. As to correcting proper names because of inconsistent quantities, if the Christian poetry of the time shows anything, it is that the greatest liberty is allowable in the metrical treatment of such names. So great a purist as Juvencus himself allows perfect freedom in the matter. Confidence in Mayor's results is weakened by the way in which he subsequently takes back what he had defended at length—see the supplement, p. 239. At N 686 there is too much dwelling upon a mere typographical error in Pitra—the printing of *umbra* for *unda*. The final result in G 6, 91 and 138 is hardly satisfactory. I do not think that the author can establish the forms *domni*, etc., for Cyprian. Strange that the verse G 225 has escaped the critical eye of so many theologian-editors who have up to the present allowed *Sethum* to stand, while any Sunday-school scholar would amend to *Senum* (Gen. V 31). The verse E 563 I would amend:

Cui sit gloria dum honore pollens.

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD.

Note. I take this opportunity to make corrections of C. Marold's text of Juvencus (Leipsic, 1886):

II 74, for *orabunt* read *orabant*.

II 191, for *senior* read *senior matris*.

IV 302, for *calvavit* read *calcavit*.

IV 663, for *possesso* read *possessio*.

IV 716, for *procerum* read *procerum solus*.—J. T. H.